

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-18, 20-24, and 28 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 3-18 and 20-24 stand rejected; Claims 9 and 24-27 have been cancelled herein; and Claim 28 is new. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

APPLICANTS INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants thank the Examiner for speaking to the undersigned on Tuesday, January 10, 2006. During the conversation, the cited art and pending claims were discussed. Applicants have amended the claims based on the conversation with the Examiner.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-18 and 20-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cahuzac (U.S. Pat. No. 5,914,002; hereinafter "Cahuzac"). As Claim 9 has been cancelled, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been rendered moot. The rejection is respectfully traversed as to Claims 1, 3-8, 10-18, and 20-23.

At the outset, Applicants note that independent Claim 1 has been amended to include:

a second CAD native geometric shape representative of the tool side ply, the second CAD native geometric shape comprising a trim of the first CAD native geometric shape; and

a stacking order determined by a name of a collector for the first trimmed CAD native geometric shape and a name of a collector for the second trimmed CAD native geometric shape.

Applicants also note that independent Claim 13 has been amended to include:

representing the tool side ply with a second CAD native geometric shape by starting with the first CAD native geometric shape and trimming the first CAD native geometric shape to create the second CAD native geometric shape;

Applicant respectfully asserts that these features as claimed are not taught or suggested whatsoever by Cahuzac.

Cahuzac appears to disclose software which merely takes a shape of a component which was previously described through other software and converts that shape into mathematical X, Y and Z coordinates. Then, the program drives a needle to a stitch in a pattern described by the X, Y and Z coordinates. (See at least column 4, lines 39 through 48). In addition, as noted by the Examiner, Cahuzac does not teach or suggest whatsoever starting with the first CAD native geometric shape and trimming the first CAD native geometric shape to create the second CAD native geometric shape, as set forth in the pending claims. Rather, Cahuzac, at best, appears to teach using orthogonal planes to configure the next cutting level (see at least Column 4, Lines 49-55). Applicants further submit that it would be improper to modify Cahuzac to include trimming the first CAD native geometric shape to create the second CAD native geometric shape, as claimed herein, as there is no teaching or suggestion in Cahuzac whatsoever regarding the desirability of this modification. Applicants further note that Cahuzac does not disclose or suggest a use of a stacking order, as claimed herein and also noted by the Examiner.

Accordingly, as Cahuzac does not teach Applicants' invention as claimed, Applicants respectfully assert that independent Claims 1 and 13 are patentable and in condition for allowance. In addition, as Claims 3-8, 10-12, 14-18 and 20-23 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claims 1 and 13, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are also patentable and in condition for allowance.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 24-27 are rejected as being unpatentable over Cahuzac in view of Matheson (U.S. Patent No. 6,718,218; hereinafter "Matheson"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As Claims 24-27 have been cancelled, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been rendered moot. Withdrawal rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIMS

Applicants have added new Claim 28. Support for new Claim 28 can be found in the specification as filed and, therefore, does not constitute new matter. In addition, as new Claim 28 depends from independent Claim 13, which is believed to be patentable and in condition for allowance, Applicants also believe new Claim 28 is patentable and in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests

that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 15, 2006

By: 

Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686
Erica K. Schaefer, Reg. No. 55,861

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

EKS/lf-s

G:\eschaefe\7784\000600-699\000622\Amendment AF due 03-06-06\Amendment.doc